THE COURT: Whether he was terminated or not.

MR. NEGRON GARCIA: Yes. Your Honor, as a matter of

fact, Your Honor obviously has read the case it doesn't say that

we are terminating this contract at all.

We are putting different conditions for X reasons

We are putting different conditions for X reasons. And, obviously, if they are presenting the document they have to accept all the contents of that document.

MR. MCCULLOCK: Your Honor, I'm asking him about a document that they admitted to be in evidence. It's in evidence and I'm asking about what happened after the document was received by the witness.

THE COURT: But his objection is that the question that you're asking is against the contents of the document.

MR. MCCULLOCK: Is against the contents?

THE COURT: It's against the contents.

MR. MCCULLOCK: The contents speak for itself. I'm asking the witness solely about who he contacted and when, regarding --

THE COURT: But that's the problem. You can ask him about who he spoke to, about and when. But the problem is that you're putting an end to that question by stating a premise which is against the letter.

MR. MCCULLOCK: Let me go back.

THE COURT: All right.

By MR. MCCULLOCK:

Eve, correct?

25

```
40
               You people went home early.
1
         Yes, we go generally before time.
2
    A
         The next day was a regular holiday New Years Day, correct?
3
         Yes.
4
    Α
               MR. NEGRON GARCIA: Objection, Your Honor. Excuse me,
5
    but I don't see the relevance.
6
               THE COURT: Well --
7
               MR. NEGRON GARCIA: Up to now.
8
               THE COURT: Overruled.
9
               MR. MCCULLOCK: You can answer.
10
               THE INTERPRETER: He did.
11
     By MR. MCCULLOCK:
12
          Now, at the time you first saw this letter -- withdrawn.
13
     this letter, there is a demand that something be done by January
14
     2nd, isn't there?
15
16
          Yes.
          When you first saw this letter was it before or after
17
     January 2nd?
18
          I don't remember the exact date.
19
          Now, subsequent to this letter did you have a discussion
20
     with Mr. Seligman of Graham-Field Express?
21
                THE COURT: Did you have a discussion, subsequent to
22
      this letter?
23
      By MR. MCCULLOCK:
 24
           Subsequent to receiving this letter did you have a
 25
      Q
```

By MR. MCCULLOCK:

- Do you know whether Mr. Seligman wrote a letter to Tuffcare 1 about seeking to get reinstated to Tuffcare as a distributor? 2 I had no knowledge of that letter. Α Mr. Guzman, did you attend a trade show in New Orleans in October of 1997, on behalf of Graham-Field Express? 5 Yes. 6 Α And at that time did you speak with Mr. Chang about the future of Tuffcare in Puerto Rico? Yes. And at that time did he tell you that he was setting up his 10 own distribution system in Puerto Rico. 11 Basically, the conversation that we had in New Orleans was 12 as to how I was going to do the marketing of his products. 13 How V.C. Medical was going to continue to do the marketing 14 of his products? 15 GF Express. 16 At that time he didn't tell you that he was prepared to 17 enter into an agreement with Jesus Garcia, Jesus Garcia was going to be his exclusive sales representative in Puerto Rico, did he? 19 No. 20 And he didn't tell you that he was going to set up a company 21 called Medex that would lease its own warehouse and warehouse 22 Tuffcare goods for direct sale into Puerto Rico?
  - And he didn't tell you he was going to start selling

23

24

25

No.

And when you met with Mr. Chang at that time in October, did

24

25

Α

That is correct.

MR. MCCULLOCK: But Your Honor, it's his witness. I'm cross-examining his witness and for that reason I should be allowed to ask leading questions. I don't have to qualify him as a hostile witness, I'm not the one who called him.

And this is not direct, this is cross examination.

And on cross examination of a witness that they presented I should be allowed to ask.

THE COURT: Mr. Garcia.

MR. NEGRON GARCIA: Yes, Your Honor, to start with Mr. Guzman was subpoenaed by me. So it's a matter of I subpoenaed him, because we subpoenaed through the rules of the Court the same as he subpoenaed the other witnesses himself.

The other thing, Your Honor, is that in this moment Mr. Guzman -- he's asking questions about Mr. Guzman's dealings with, you know, as president.

And in that moment he's an adversary or whatever of Mr. Chang because he can't bring up -- I basically feel that he would be used, if necessary we would be using him as rebuttal witness of, you know, of the statements of their witnesses.

Because they're the ones who are moving this Court to issue a preliminary injunction, and up to now the only evidence that has been presented has been our evidence whereby we complied with Your Honor's orders that we show why it should not be issued, but they haven't established one single fact.

On the contrary, what we're saying is that they

made allegations that they introduce in their claim having sustained at all what we have in evidence that those allegations are not true.

THE COURT: I know, but you're way ahead of me. I have the narrow question of fact. If this, the narrow question before me if I should allow this witness to be cross examined with leading questions, which normally you can do, there is no doubt about it. But the fact is that he's the president of -- he was the president of plaintiff, and in that sense, in that sense if I have to align him, I have to align him on your side and not on their side as to the fact that he was a former president.

MR. MCCULLOCK: But, Your Honor, he's been presented by them as a witness. Not by me. And it's a former president and he's no longer involved with the company.

And I'm asking him about past events. I just -- I don't see that -- I don't think that the status of where a person was, whose side he was on before or after because sometimes you don't know where a person was at the time, who he was negotiating for. I don't think --

THE COURT: But in this case I do. He was the president. And you're asking him of facts during his incumbency as president, am I correct in that?

MR. MCCULLOCK: Yes. But I'm asking about evidence -testimony that was adduced in his direct. When he gave in
response to their questions they didn't have to -- they asked

- 1 Q Okay.
- 2 A Make the same efforts.
- 3 Q But you were selling other products besides Tuffcare
- 4 products when you became president of the corporation?
- 5 A That is correct.
- 6 Q And you devoted time to sell wheelchairs that competed with
- 7 | Tuffcare; am I correct?
- 8 A That is correct.
- 9 Q Did you receive any instructions from your superiors while
- 10 you were -- superiors from Graham-Field as to the efforts you
- 11 | should devote to sell Tuffcare products, particularly the
- 12 | wheelchairs?
- MR. MCCULLOCK: Objection, Your Honor. I didn't cover
- any of this on cross. This is not redirect. It's all new
- 15 material.
- MR. NEGRON GARCIA: May I, Your Honor. No, it's
- 17 basically taken -- he started asking questions about the
- relationship with Mr. Chang and the reasons Mr. Chang may have
- 19 had to terminate, in his words, he's using that objective, we
- 20 don't accept it, the relationship.
- So, I want to establish from the same that he
- opened the door to establish the other reasons that may have
- 23 happened, the things that happened between him and his superior.
- 24 And he basically answering the basic question, of his
- 25 conversations with his superiors I'm just going broader.

```
56
   stipulation was September 4th, 1990, until December 31st, 1990,
1
   was two hundred thousand.
              MR. NEGRON GARCIA: 1996, Your Honor.
3
              THE COURT: 1996.
4
              MR. NEGRON GARCIA: That was the stipulation. That's
5
    what I'm asking.
6
              THE COURT: And then 1997 four hundred and twenty-five
7
    thousand, around.
8
              MR. MCCULLOCK: Yes.
9
    By MR. NEGRON GARCIA:
10
          I'm asking: Can you state the reason why, instead of
11
     selling around eight hundred thousand dollars or six hundred
12
     thousand dollars, whatever, you sold only four hundred fifty
13
     thousand?
               THE COURT: I think I have the answer to that. He's
15
     already provided the answer to that. I think the record is
16
     clear. He testified that they were selling competing products.
 17
      That's what he testified.
 1/8
                MR. NEGRON GARCIA: Yes, Your Honor. Thank you, Your
وړ
      Honor. I'm sorry, but it's late in the afternoon.
 20
                THE COURT: No, it's not that late.
 21
                MR. NEGRON GARCIA: But Your Honor, you have more
 22
      stamina than I do.
 23
                      We would have no more questions.
  24
                 THE COURT: Good, sir, you're excused.
  25
```

distribution arrangement with Graham-Field, that you had

24

25